



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,726	08/04/2003	Lee Weng	THERUS.007C1	5582
20995 7590 11/26/2007 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			EXAMINER FERNANDEZ, KATHERINE L	
			ART UNIT 3768	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/633,726

Applicant(s)

WENG ET AL.

Examiner

Katherine L. Fernandez

Art Unit

3768

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine L. Fernandez.

(3) Ryan Melnick.

(2) Eric Winakur.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10-17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Vaezy (US 6,425,867); Chapelon (US 5,601,526); Fujimoto (US 5,643,179).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant reviewed the history of the case and discussed the Affidavit filed on 9/26/2005. Applicant further discussed differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. In particular, applicant discussed that the claimed invention heats a larger tissue area. Amendments to claims were suggested and discussed. The applicant will take into further consideration the discussion when filing the formal response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ERIC F. WINAKUR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Kathy Fernandez
Examiner's signature, if required